85-506

NO.

Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
SEP 24 1985
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

In the Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1985

PETER A. ASCANI, SR., INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF THE ESTATE OF DAVID NATHAN ASCANI, PETER A. ASCANI, JR., ANNA SCHMIT, DARIUS ASCANI, JESSE ASCANI, MERCEDES REINERTH AND DARLEEN BOYLE

Petitioners

versus

DARRELL HUGHES AND TERRENCE DUFFY, INDIVIDUALLY AND IN THEIR CAPACITIES AS OFFICERS OF THE NEW ORLEANS POLICE DEPARTMENT, HENRY MORRIS, INDIVIDUALLY AND IN HIS CAPACITY AS CHIEF OF POLICE OF THE NEW ORLEANS POLICE DEPARTMENT, THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS AND TRANSIT CASUALTY COMPANY

Respondent

ON APPEAL FROM THE SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT

ROY A. RASPANTI
3732 Canal Street
New Orleans, La. 70119
(504) 482-5701

COUNSEL FOR PETITIONER

10 pp

QUESTIONS PRESENTED BY APPEAL

1. Does the estate of a person killed by a city police officer, acting under color of state law and without due process of law, have a claim for relief for loss of life under 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983 and the Fourteenth Amendment when the state law does not allow the estate to recover for loss of life?
2. Whether a sibling has a constitutionally-protected liberty interest in the continued society of an association with a fellow sibling.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Questions Presented By Appeal i

Table of Authorities iii

Official Report of Opinion
of Fourth Circuit iv

Grounds on which Jurisdiction
is invoked iv

Constitutional Provisions and
Statutes which Case Involves v

Statement of the Case 1

APPENDIX

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES PAGE

Ascani v Hughes 470 So. 2d 207, (La. App. 4 Cir. 1985).....11, 25, 26

Bell v City of Milwaukee.....6,7,12,13
746 F. 2d 1205, (7 Cir.....17,20,24
1984).....25,26,29

Bivens v Six Unknown Named Agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics 403 U.S. 388, 91 S. Ct. 1999 21,22,28

Butz v Economou 438 U.S. 478 23

Callais v Allstate Insurance Company 334 So. 2d 692 (La. 1975) 10

Carey v Piphus 435 U.S. 247 98, S. Ct. 1042.....13,14

Carlson v Green 446 U.S. 14, 100 S. Ct. 1458.....5,21,22,23
(1980).....24,28,29,30

Guyton v Phillips 532 F. Supp. 1154 (N.D.....14,15,20
Calif. 1981).....25,26,29

Jaco v Bloechle 739 F. 2d.....15,16,24
239 (6 Cir. 1984).....25,26,29

Johnson v Railway Express Agency, Inc. 421 U.S. 454, 95 S. Ct. 1716.....7

Meyer v Nebraska 262 U.S. 390, 435 S. Ct. 625.....30

Moore v City of East Cleveland 431 U.S. 494, 97 S. Ct. 1932.....30

Robertson v Wegmann 436, U.S. 584, 98 S. Ct. 1991, (1978) 5,7,8,12,17,18,19,20,21,22,24,25,28,29,30

Roche v Big Moose Oil Field Truck Service 381 So. 2d 396 (La. 1980).....10

Sullivan v Little Hunting Party Inc. 396 U.S. 229, 90 S. Ct. 400, (1969).....8,14

OPINION BELOW

Opinion of Court of Appeals below reported at 470 So. 2d 207.

GROUNDS ON WHICH JURISDICTION IS INVOKED

1. Appellate proceeding;
2. Date of denial of writ by Louisiana Supreme Court June 28, 1985.

3. Notice of Appeal filed September 13, 1985 in Louisiana Supreme Court.

4. Statue conferring jurisdiction of appeal on this court: 28 U.S.C. 1257

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND STATUTES WHICH CASE INVOLVES

1. "No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property without due process of law..." Fourteenth Amendment.

2. "Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be

subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress..." 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983.

3. "The jurisdiction in civil and criminal matters conferred on the district courts by the provisions of this chapter (title 42)...shall be exercised and enforced in conformity with the laws of the United States, so far as such laws are suitable to carry the same into effect; but in all cases where they are not adapted to the object, or are deficient in the provisions

necessary to furnish suitable remedies and punish offenses against law, the common law, as modified, and changed by the constitution and statutes of the state wherein the court having jurisdiction of such civil or criminal case is held, so far as the same is not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, shall be extended to govern the said courts in the trial and disposition of the cause..."

42 U.S.C. Sec. 1988

4. "A. Every act whatever of man that causes damage to another obligates him by whose fault it happened to repair it.

B. Damages may include loss of consortium, service, and society, and shall be recoverable by the same respective categories of

persons who would have had a cause of action for wrongful death of an injured person.

C. (1) The right to recover damages to property caused by an offense or quasi-offense is a property right which, on the death of the obligee, is inherited by his legal, instituted, or irregular heirs, subject to the community rights of the surviving spouse.

(2) As used in this Paragraph, property damages may include expenses or monetary obligations necessarily incurred by the obligee on account of such offense or quasi-offense; however, if the obligee is survived by any beneficiary enumerated in the following Paragraph of this Article, such expenses or obligations shall be recoverable by said beneficiaries.

D. (1) The right to recover all other damages caused by an offense or quasi-offense, if the injured person dies, shall survive for a period of one year from the death of the deceased in favor of:

(a) The surviving spouse and child or children of the deceased, or either such spouse or such child or children;

(b) The surviving father and mother of the deceased, or either of them, if he left no spouse or child surviving; and

(c) The surviving brothers and sisters of the deceased, or any of them, if he left no spouse, child, or parent surviving.

(2) The survivors in whose favor this right of action survives may also recover the damages which

they sustained through the wrongful death of the deceased.

(3) A right to recover damages under the provisions of this Paragraph is a property right which, on the death of the survivor in whose favor the right of action survived, is inherited by his legal, instituted, or irregular heirs, whether suit has been instituted thereon by the survivor or not.

E. As used in this Article, the words "child", "brother", "sister", "father", and "mother" include a child, brother, sister, father and mother, by adoption, respectively."

La. Civil Code Art. 2315

STATEMENT OF FACTS

In the early morning hours of Monday, February 7, 1983 officers Terrence Duffy and Darryl Hughes of the New Orleans Police Department, while on D.W.I. patrol duty, gave chase to a vehicle occupied by decedent, David Nathan Ascani. The vehicle driven by Ascani came to a stop on Poydras Street in front of the New Orleans Superdome. Officers Duffy and Hughes approached the Ascani vehicle on foot and, in a reckless and callous disregard of and indifference to the rights and safety of Ascani, opened fire on him. Three shots were fired. Ascani was shot one time through the left deltoid muscle. The bullet entered the chest cavity and pierced the jugular and trachea causing his death approximately one-half hour later. Officers Duffy and Hughes said

that they gave chase to the Ascani vehicle because he appeared to be a drunk driver. Subsequent tests showed that Ascani had no alcohol or drugs in his blood at the time of his death.

Ascani was survived by his father and six brothers and sisters. Actions under 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983 and in tort under Louisiana Civil Code Article 2315 werebrought by the father and brothers and sisters of Ascani and by the father on behalf of the estate of Ascani. The questions presented for review herein were first raised in the trial court by a motion to dismiss for failure to state a cause of action. On June 11, 1984, the trial court dismissed the claims of decedent, Ascani's estate and his siblings. Appeal was taken to the Louisiana Fourth Circuit Court of Appeal where the decision of the trial court was affirmed on May 8, 1985. Writs were

denied by the Louisiana Supreme Court on June 28, 1985.

I

Does the estate of a person killed by a city police officer, acting under color of state law and without due process of law, have a claim for relief for loss of life under 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983 and the Fourteenth Amendment when state law does not allow the estate to recover for loss of life?

There is no question that the Fourteenth Amendment (P. vi, supra) protects individuals from deprivation by a state or its officials of life without due process of law.

Clearly, under the Fourteenth Amendment, the killing of a person by a city police officer under color of state law and without due process of law is prohibited. In the case at bar, David

Nathan Ascani (Ascani) was deprived of his life without due process of law. He was not tried by a judge or jury; he was not even arrested or charged with any offense. He was summarily executed by two officers of the New Orleans Police Department. This outrageous act by these officers of the New Orleans Police Department is clearly prohibited by he Fourteenth Amendment and, therefore, provides the basis for a claim under 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983. It is submitted that Ascani has a claim for relief for loss of life under the Fourteenth Amendment and 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983. Further, he possesses that claim for relief even when state law would not allow his estate to recover for loss of life.

A claim for relief for a violation of the Fourteenth Amendment by a governmental actor is provided for by 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983. The Fourteenth

Amendment protects individuals from deprivation by the state of life, liberty or property without due process of law. When the state does take the life, liberty or property of an individual without due process of law, 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983 provides that individual with a claim for relief (P. vii, supra).

Further, the fundamental policies behind Sec. 1983 are twofold - compensation for and deterrence of unconstitutional acts committed under state law:

> "The policies underlying Sec. 1983 include compensation of persons injured by deprivation of federal rights and prevention of abuses of power those acting under color of state law." Robertson v Wegmann 436 U.S. 584, 591, 98 S. Ct. 1991, 1995 (1978); Carlson v Green 446 U.S. 14, 100 S. Ct. 1468.

One of the primary reasons Sec. 1983 was enacted was to remedy and deter

acts violative of the Fourteenth Amendment. The legislative history behind Sec. 1983 expresses an unequivocal concern for protecting the life of innocent victims from state officials, such as police officers. See Bell v Milwaukee 746 F. 2d 1205, 1239 (7 Cir. 1984). Ascani (or his estate) has a claim for relief for loss of his life under Sec. 1983. The civil rights acts do not specify many issues, such as the survivability of Sec. 1983 actions, who can sue when a civil rights victim is killed, or the measure of available damages. Bell v Milwaukee 746 F. 2d 1205, 1234 (7 Cir. 1984). Handling of deficiencies of this type in civil rights statutes is provided for in 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1988 (P. viii, supra).

Thus, Sec. 1988 invokes state law when civil rights statutes such as 42

U.S.C. Sec. 1983 are "deficient", unless the state law involved is "inconsistent with" the Constitution and federal law. See Robertson v Wegmann 436 U.S. 584, 587-588, 98 S. Ct. 1991, 1993-1994 (1978). As the Seventh Circuit explained in Bell v Milwaukee 746 F. 2d 1205, 1234 (7 Cir. 1984) Sec. 1988:

> "...establishes a three-step process for the selection of the appropriate substantive law in civil rights cases. First, the court must decide whether the civil rights acts are 'deficient' in furnishing a particular rule. If this inquiry is answered affirmatively, state law is examined to fill the interstices in the federal provisions... Finally, the state law must be disregarded in favor of the federal law if the state law is inconsistent with the meaning and purpose of federal statutory and Constitutional law."

Of fundamental importance is whether the application of state law "would be inconsistent with the federal policy underlying the cause of action..." Johnson v Railway Express

Agency, Inc. 421 U.S. 454, 465, 95 S. Ct. 1716, 1722. This court, in Robertson v Wegmann, 436 U.S. 584, 590, 98 S. Ct. 1991, 1995 (1978), explained:

> "In resolving questions of inconsistency between federal and state law raised under Sec. 1988, courts must look not only at particular federal statutes and constitutional provisions, but also at 'the policies expressed in (them).' Sullivan v Little Hunting Party, Inc. 396 U.S. 229, 240, 90 S. Ct. 400, 406 (1969)."

These policies again, include compensation of persons injured by deprivation of federal rights and prevention of abuses of power by those acting under color of state law, i.e. deterrence. Robertson v Wegmann 436 U.S. 584, 585, 98 S. Ct. 1991, 1995 (1978). Clearly, then the policy of Sec. 1983 is that innocent victims should be compensated and local government officials should pay so that

others will know that they should not commit violations.

Therefore, since the civil rights acts are "deficient" in not specifying survivability of Sec. 1983 actions or who can sue when the civil rights victim is killed, reference must be made to Louisiana law to determine whether the Ascani estate has a claim for relief.

The appropriate provision is Louisian Civil Code Article 2315. Article 2315 provides for two types of actions only - a "survival action" and a "wrongful death action". A "survival action" is an action for damages sustained by the victim for which he could have recovered had he lived, such as the pain and suffering which he endured from the time of his injury to the time of his death. A "wrongful death action" is one for damages to survivors occasioned by the victim's

death. See, e.g., Callais v Allstate Insurance Company 334 So. 2d 692 (La. 1975). Recovery in a Louisiana wrongful death action or a survival action under Article 2315 cannot, however, include damages for the loss of life itself. As the Louisiana court in the case at bar stated, Article 2315 designates three classes of beneficiaries, and the estate of the decedent is not among these designated beneficiaries. Citing Roche v Big Moose Oil Field Truck Service 381 So. 2d 396 (La. 1980), the Louisiana court stated:

> "...Article 2315 designates three classes of beneficiaries:
> 1. The surviving spouse and child or children of the deceased, or either of such spouse or such child or children;
> 2. The surviving father and mother of the deceased, or either of them, if there is no spouse or child surviving; and
> 3. The surviving brothers and sisters of the deceased, or any of them, if there is no

spouse, child, or parent surviving.

> Persons not specified in Article 2315 are without a remedy...The estate of the decedent is not among the designated beneficiaries. Therefore, Mr. Ascani's claim on behalf of the estate does not state a cause of action." Ascani v Hughes 470 So. 2d 207, 209 (La. App. 4 Cir., 1985).

Had the police officers merely maimed Ascani, instead of killing him, he would have had a claim for relief under Sec. 1983 and he would have had a cause of action in Louisiana tort law against them. Since they killed him, according to the court below, he has neither the claim under Sec. 1983 nor the tort claim under Louisiana law. Therefore, it was actually to the advantage of the police officers to kill him rather than injure him. As the Seventh Circuit pointed out:

> "Moreover, if Sec. 1983 did not allow recovery for loss of life notwithstanding inhospitable

> state law deterrence would be further subverted since it would be more advantageous to the unlawful actor to kill rather than injure." Bell v City of Milwaukee 746 F. 2d 1205, 1239 (7 Cir. 1984).

All federal courts that have considered this question, which was reserved by this Court in Robertson (supra), have held that the estate of a person killed by a state officer without due process of law has a claim for relief for loss of life under Sec. 1983 and the Fourteenth Amendment even when the state law would not allow the estate to recover for loss of life. The facts in Bell v City of Milwaukee 746 F. 2d 1205, (7 Cir. 1984), were amazingly similar to the facts in the case at bar. Plaintiff brought an action for loss of life under Sec. 1983 on behalf of the estateof his son who had been killed by Milwaukee police officers. The court referred to Wisconsin law under the

"three-step process" described above and found that it did not allow for recovery of damages for loss of life itself. The Wisconsin law was almost identical to Louisiana Civil Code Article 2315 with respect to this issue. Wisconsin provided for a survival action and a wrongful death action. Bell, 746 F. 2d 1235-1236. The court held that the Wisconsin statute, which would have precluded recovery by the son's estate for loss of life, was inconsistent with the deterrent policy of Sec. 1983 and the Fourteenth Amendment's protection of life. The Bell case relied upon language from two Supreme Court decisions in coming to its conclusion:

> "As the Supreme Court observed in Carey v Piphus, 435 U.S. 247, 258 98 S. Ct. 1042, 1049..., 'It is not clear...that common-law tort rules of damages will provide a complete solution to the damage issue in every Sec. 1983 case'. Therefore, it is appropriate, as

> the Supreme Court had noted in regard to Sec. 1983 damage issues, to fashion, 'a federal rule responsive to the need whenever a federal right is impaired Sullivan v Little Hunting Party, Inc. 396 U.S. 229, 240 90 S. Ct. 400 406..."

In Guyton v Phillips, 532 F. Supp. 1154 (N.D. Calif. 1981), a federal court again ruled in favor of a claim remarkably similar to that of the instant plaintiff. In Guyton, the mother of a boy, shot and killed by police officers, brought suit on behalf of the deceased minor as administratrix of the estate under Sec. 1983. Under state survival law, the estate could not recover for pain and suffering sustained prior to death nor for the loss of life. Citing Carey v Piphus, (supra) for the proposition that state common law tort rules of damages may be inconsistent with the policy underlying Sec. 1983, to the court held that the estate was

entitled to recover for loss of life and pain and suffering. Plaintiff could, therefore, recover under Sec. 1983. The court cited both the compensation and deterrence policies underlying Sec. 1983. Guyton, (supra), 532 F. Supp. 1154, 1167-1168.

In Jaco v Bloechle 739 F. 2d 239 (6 Cir. 1984) the Sec. 1983 civil rights action of the decedent could not survive under Ohio law because, under that law, the survival claim had to be predicated upon the decedent's claim for damages sustained during his lifetime. Since the Jaco decedent died instantaneously, his cause of action for the infringement of his civil rights could not survive under Ohio law. In holding that the civil rights action survived despite the Ohio law which caused it to abate the Sixth Circuit stated:

"The Sec. 1983 objective of protecting individuals' civil liberties by providing compensation to the victim for an illegal deprivation of constitutional entitlements by state officers cannot be advanced, and is only undermined by deferring to a state law which decrees abatement..." Jaco 739 F. 2d 239, 244-245.

The Jaco court went on to discuss the second purpose of Sec. 1983, deterrence:

"Surely, Sec. 1983's further purpose to discourage official constitutional infringement would be threatened if Jaco were not permitted to champion her dead son's civil rights. Ohio survivorship law is then hostile to 'the constitution and the laws of the United States'. To afford effect to the expressions and corrections of the Supreme Court in Robertson v Wegmann, where, as here, the survival statutes of the foreign state are hostile to promoting deterrence, protection and vindication against Sec. 1983 civil rights infringements perpetrated under color of law, the federal court must implement the congressional intent by allowing survival." Jaco 739 F. 2d 239, 245.

The conflict between the Louisiana courts and all of the federal courts that have addressed this question is clear. It is, therefore, extremely important that this court make a specific pronouncement on the existence of a federal rule allowing the estate of victims killed under color of state law to recover for loss of life in a Sec. 1983 action notwithstanding restrictive state law. Bell v Milwaukee 746 F. 2d 1205, 1238 (7 Cir. 1984). In Robertson v Wegmann, 436 U.S. 584, 594, 98 S. Ct. 1991, 1997 (1978), this court explicitly declined to express any view on this question. Today's appeal affords this court its first clear opportunity to answer this question left open by the Robertson v Wegmann decision.

> "We intimate no view, moreover, about whether abatement based on state law could be allowed in a situation in which deprivation of federal rights caused death."

Robertson v Wegmann, 436 U.S. 584, 594, 98 S. Ct. 1991, 1997 (1978).

In Robertson v Wegmann, this court considered the same Louisiana Civil Code Article 2315 before the court in this case. In Robertson, however, plaintiff brought a Sec. 1983 action for malicious prosecution and died while his suit was pending of causes unrelated to the civil rights claim. The court held that, pursuant to Sec. 1988, the applicable Louisiana law governed the survivability issue (i.e. there was not an inconsistency under step two, supra). Under the state law, the decedent's action abated because no person with a requisite relationship to him was alive at the time of his death. Concluding that this outcome was not inconsistent with the policies of Sec. 1983, because the death was unrelated to the constitutional

violation, this court ruled that the action did not survive:

> "In order to find even a marginal influence on behavior as a result of Louisiana survivorship provisions, one would have to make the rather far fetched assumptions that a state official had both the desire and the ability deliberately to select as victims only those persons who died before conclusion of the Sec. 1983 suit for reasons entirely unconnected with the official illegality and who would not be survived by any close relative." Robertson v Wegmann 436 U.S. 584, 592, 98 S. Ct. 1991, 1996 n. 10.

The Robertson court expressly declined to express any view on the particular issue before this court today, namely, whether a state law can preclude a claim by the estate where the deprivation of constitutional rights itself caused the death. Robertson 436 U.S. 584, 594, 98 S. Ct. 1991, 1997.

But the deterrence objective of Sec. 1983 was not present in Robertson v Wegmann as it is here (and

as it was in Bell v Milwaukee and Guyton v Phillips, supra). In Robertson, death was an independent, intervening circumstance and, therefore, the court did not perceive any significant loss of deterrence if the restrictive Louisiana statute were applied. By contrast, in the instant case, (and in Bell and Guyton), the killing itself was the unconstitutional act. In such cases, there will be a substantial loss in the deterrence of official lawlessness if the victim's estate could not bring suit to recover for loss of life. Indeed, if state law could prevent a Sec. 1983 action for loss of life, then deterrence would be further subverted since it would be more advantageous to the defendant violating the constitutional rights to kill rather than injure. Bell v Milwaukee, 746 F. 2d 1239. In

Robertson, this court could not reach the question presented in the case at bar. Today, finally, this court has the opportunity to reach that question.

In making that decision, this court should consider its decision in an analogous case, Carlson v Green 446 U.S. 14, 100 S. Ct. 1458 (1980). This was an action like Bivens v Six Unknown Named Agents of the Fed. Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. .388, 91 S. Ct. 1999, i.e., an action brought not against the state or local officials under Sec. 1983 but against federal officials and premised upon the constitution. In that case, the Court allowed recovery by the estate notwithstanding restrictive state law.

The action in Carlson was brought by a mother on behalf of the estate of her deceased son, alleging that federal prison officials grossly neglected his medical condition. Plaintiff argued

that defendant's acts and omissions violated the deceased's Eighth and Fourteenth Amendment rights. Under Indiana law, no recovery was available where the acts complained of caused the victim's death. Although, not explicitly discussing the component of damages for loss of life, this Court found that a uniform federal rule was necessary to achieve the Bivens policy of deterring officials from violating federal or constitutional rights so it held:

> "Whenever the relevant state survival statute would abate a Bivens type action brought against defendants whose conduct results in death, the federal common law allows survival of the action." Carlson 446 U.S. 14, 24, 100 S. Ct. 1468, 1474.

The court distinguished Robertson on the grounds that in Carlson as in the present case, the plaintiff's death was caused by the defendants'

unconstitutional acts. Carlson 436 U.S. 14, 24-25 100 S. Ct. 1468, 1474-1475.

Thus, the Carlson Court's emphasis on the need to deter officials from committing violations of constitutional rights that result in the death of the victim strongly indicates that the Ascani estate would have a claim for loss of life if Ascani had been killed by federal officers, notwithstanding inhospitable Louisiana law. Moreover, both Justices Powell and Stewart explicitly acknowledged in their concurrences that they would reach the same result in Sec. 1983 cases:

> "In Butz v Economou 438 U.S. 478, 498-504...the court thought it unseemly that different rules should govern the liability of federal and state officers for similar constitutional wrongs. I would not disturb that understanding today. Carlson v Green 446 U.S. 14, 30, 100 S. Ct. 1468, 1477.

Yet, despite the implication of Carlson v Green and Robertson v Wegmann, the Supreme Court has not yet been given the opportunity to make a specific pronouncement that the estate of victims killed under color of state law can recover for loss of life in a Sec. 1983 action notwithstanding restrictive state law. Bell v Milwaukee 746 F 2d at 1238. This is such an opportunity, one which the court should take in order to resolve the inconsistencies among the lower courts. The lower federal courts (Bell, Guyton, Jaco) are clearly and uniformly stating that the estate of a person killed under color of state law and without due process of law has a claim for relief for loss of life under Sec. 1983 and the Fourteenth Amendment notwithstanding state law which would not allow the estate to recover for loss of life. In Louisiana, though, this

constitutional question is interpreted differently by the court below:

> "Following the rationale of Robertson, there is no reason to reach a different result where the alleged constitutional violation results in death and the decedent is survived by a parent authorized to bring a wrongful death and survival action under Article 2315..." Ascani v Hughes 470 So. 2d 207, 210 (La. App. 4 Cir. 1985).

In point of fact, reaching a different result is precisely what the federal courts which have ruled on this issue have done (Bell, Guyton, Jaco) where the constitutional violation resulted in death. And, contrary to the opinion of the Louisiana Fourth Circuit (and the Louisiana Supreme Court), a review of Carlson and Robertson would give every reason to reach a different result.

The Louisiana court further asserted:

> "It is this court's opinion that the remedies under Article 2315, as applied to this case suffice

> to meet Sec. 1983, 'deterrence of official misconduct' policy. Ascani v Hughes 470 So. 2d 207, 210, supra.

It is submitted that this conclusion flies directly in the face of Bell, Guyton and Jaco. The Louisiana court's assertion that the remedies of Article 2315 suffice to meet the Sec. 1983 deterrence of official misconduct policy is flatly wrong. (See Jaco discussion of deterrence objective, P. 15-16 supra.)

The Louisiana court wrongly concluded:

> "We find nothing in Article 2315 which is 'inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States'". Ascani v Hughes 470 So. 2d 211.

The Louisiana Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals (and the Louisiana Supreme Court) could not have committed more grievous error. Article 2315 as applied by the Louisiana court clearly upholds

an unconstitutional statute which is inconsistent with the policies of Sec. 1983 and which allows Louisiana state officials to summarily execute citizens with impunity. It is inconsistent in that, as applied, it is more advantageous for state officials (and city officials) to kill an individual than to injure him. It is inconsistent in that, as applied, it completely undermines the two-fold purpose of Sec. 1983 - deterrence and compensation. Persons can be killed in cold blood by state officials without compensation to anyone and without fear of reprisal from the federal courts under the Constitution.

The case at bar gives this Honorable Court its first chance to right this tragic wrong. The question before this Court is clear. It has been chiseled out by the Carlson and Robertson decisions. In Carlson, the

Court was presented with a Bivens action (federal official brought into federal court for violating the federal constitution) where the deprivation of the constitutional right actually resulted in the death of the victim. In Robertson, a state official violated Sec. 1983 and the violation did not cause death. The common factor shared by Carlson and Robertson was the fact that the action abated under state law. Carlson held that the federal common law allowed survival of the action and Robertson ruled that state law did not allow survival of the action (Appendix p. 27). The case at bar presents the only remaining fact pattern as yet unanswered by this court. It is an action in which a local official violated Sec. 1983 (Robertson) and the violation resulted in death (Carlson). Here, too, the court below has ruled

that the action is abated (or not allowed) under state law (Appendix P. 27). The question could not be clearer. The lower federal courts which have addressed this issue (Bell, Guyton, Jaco) have all agreed that the estate of a person killed under color of state law and without due process of law has a claim for relief for loss of life under Sec. 1983 and the Fourteenth Amendment despite state law which would not allow the estate to recover for loss of life. This is the better rule and one which should be adopted by this court in order to further the compensation and deterrence purposes behind Sec. 1983.

Today, this Honorable Court is presented with the facts necessary to decide this significant constitutional issue, an issue not addressed in the Robertson and Carlson cases but which today, may be addressed for the first

time.

We, therefore, urge this Court to note probable jurisdiction and to order full briefing and argument on this important constitutional issue.

II

Do the surviving siblings of the decedent Ascani possess a constitutional liberty interest in their association with him?

The Supreme Court has yet to address the question. Nevertheless, the federal constitution protects the network of core nuclear family relationships. Meyer v Nebraska 262 U.S. 390, 43 S. Ct. 625; Moore v City of East Cleveland 431 U.S. 494, 97 S. Ct. 1932.

We urge this Court to note probable jurisdiction and to order full briefing and argument on this issue.

APPENDIX

PETER A. ASCANI, SR., ET AL	*	CA-2823
	*	COURT OF APPEAL
VERSUS	*	
	*	FOURTH CIRCUIT
DARRELL HUGHES, ET AL	*	STATE OF LOUISIANA

* * * * * * * * *

APPEAL FROM THE CIVIL DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE PARISH OF ORLEANS,
STATE OF LOUISIANA
NO. 84-1862, DIVISION "E"
HONORABLE GERALD P. FEDOROFF, JUDGE

* * * * * * * * *

DENIS A. BARRY, JUDGE

(Court composed of Chief Judge William V. Redmann, JJ. Patrick M. Schott and Denis A. Barry)

ROY A. RASPANTI
3732 Canal Street
New Orleans, La. 70119
Attorney for Plaintiff-Appellant
(Peter A. Ascani, Sr., et al)

THOMAS P. ANZELMO
McClinchey, Stafford, Mintz,
Cellini & Lang
643 Magazine Street
New Orleans, La. 70130
Attorney for Defendants-Appellees
(City of New Orleans, Henry Morris
(as Chief of Police), and Officers
Darrell Hughes and Terrence Duffy)

MAY 8, 1985

AFFIRMED

Plaintiffs appeal the dismissal of claims by decedent's estate and his siblings for wrongful death under federal civil rights provisions. We affirm.

On February 7, 1983 David Ascani was allegedly shot and killed by two police officers and a suit for damages under state and federal law was filed:

Under La. C.C. Art. 2315:

Peter A. Ascani, Sr., Father of decedent:

Wrongful death, loss of love and affection, mental and physical pain and suffering, loss of financial support.

Peter A. Ascani, Sr., individually and on behalf of the estate of David Ascani:

Mental and physical pain and suffering, loss of life.

Under 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983:

Peter A. Ascani, Sr., Father of decedent:

Wrongful death, loss of love and affection, mental and physical pain and suffering, loss of financial support, loss of freedom of association.

Peter A. Ascani, Sr., individually and on behalf of the estate of David Ascani:

Mental and physical pain and suffering, loss of life.

Peter A. Ascani, Jr., Anna Schmit, Darius Ascani, Jesse Ascani, Mercedes Reinerth, Darlene Boyle, siblings of decedent:

Loss of freedom of association.

Defendants' exception of no cause of action to the claims on behalf of the estate and the siblings was maintained.

The exception of no cause of action tests the legal sufficiency of the petition. All well-pleaded facts are accepted as true; the issue is whether the petition supports the redress sought. Plaquemines Parish Commission Council v Perez, 379 So. 2d 1373 (La. 1980); Scariano Brothers, Inc. v. Construction, Div. of Scheyd-Brennan, Inc., 428 So. 2d 564 (La. App. 4th Cir. 1983).

Plaintiffs allege that 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983 provides an action on behalf

of the estate which is separate and distinct from Louisiana's Art. 2315 wrongful death and survival actions. Relying on Carlson v Green, 446 U.S. 14, 100 S. Ct. 1468, 64 L. Ed. 2d 15 (1980), plaintiffs argue that a uniform federal rule of survivorship must be applied to prevent abatement of the estate's claim for deprivation of decedent's constitutional right to life.

42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983 provides in part:

> Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceedings for redress.

Section 1983 has no remedial provisions, but 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1988, provides;

> The jurisdiction in civil and criminal matters conferred on the

> district courts by the provisions of this Title (including 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983)...shall be exercised and enforced in conformity with the laws of the United States, so far as such laws are suitable to carry the same into effect; but in all cases where they are not adapted to the object, or are deficient in the provisions necessary to furnish suitable remedies and punish offenses against law, the common law, as modified and changed by the constitution and statutes of the State wherein the court having jurisdiction of such civil or criminal cause is held, so far as the same is not inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States, shall be extended to and govern the said court in the trial and disposition of the cause...

Robertson v Wegmann, 436 U.S. 584, 98 S.Ct. 1991, 56 L.Ed.2d 554 (1978) and Brazier v Cherry, 293 F.2d 401 (5th Cir. 1961), cert. denied, 368 U.S. 921, 82 S.Ct. 243, 7 L.Ed.2d 136 (1961) set forth the following hierarchy of authority under Sec. 1988:

> Federal statutory law applies unless "not adapted to the object" or"deficient";

State law applies unless it is "inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States";

Federal "common law" applies.

"Although Sec. 1988 is directed to federal district courts, it provides, by analogy, even greater justification for a state court to apply state law when the federal cause of action is adjudicated in the state court system." Ricard v State, 390 So.2d 882, 885 (La. 1980).

Because federal statutory law does not address the survival of Sec. 1983 claims, who the injured parties are when the victim is killed, or the measure of available damages, resort must be made to state law unless it is inconsistent with federal law. Robertson v Wegmann, supra; Bell v City of Milwaukee, 746 F.2d 1205 (7th Cir. 1984).

Louisiana law most analogous to plaintiffs' Sec. 1983 claims is La. C.C. Art. 2315. Robertson v Wegmann, supra; Love v Davis, 353 F.Supp 587 (W.D.La. 1972). It allows a survival action and a wrongful death action. Callais v Allstate Insurance Co., 334 So.2d 692 (La. 1975) (on rehearing).

Unlike statutes in many states which specify a personal representative to bring the action, Art. 2315 designates three classes of beneficiaries:

> (1) the surviving spouse and child or children of the deceased, or either such spouse or such child or children;
>
> (2) the surviving father and mother of the deceased, or either of them, if there is no spouse or child surviving; and
>
> (3) the surviving brothers and sisters of the deceased, or any of them, if there is no spouse, child or parents surviving.

Persons not specified in Art. 2315 are without a remedy. Roche v Big Moose Oilfield Truck Service, 381 So.2d 396 (La. 1980). The estate of a decedent is not among the designated beneficiaries. Therefore, Mr. Ascani's claim on behalf of the estate does not state a cause of action. See Cullivan v State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company, 428 So.2d 1231 (La. App. 3rd Cir. 1983), writ denied, 433 So.2d 180, 181 (La. 1983).

The narrow issue, then, is whether under these facts Art. 2315 is "inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States" so as to require application of "federal common law."

In Robertson v Wegmann, supra, the issue was whether an executor could be substituted for a deceased plaintiff with no surviving parents, wife, children or siblings, or whether the action

must be dismissed on the ground of abatement. The Supreme Court, relying on Sec. 1988, discerned a deficiency in federal law to the extent that it was silent on the issue of survival of a Sec. 1983 action. It applied Art. 2315, finding nothing in the article or its underlying policies to indicate that because it caused abatement of a particular action it should invariably be ignored in favor of absolute survivorship.

The Court noted:

> It is true that Sec. 1983 provides 'a uniquely federal remedy against incursions under the claimed authority of state law upon rights secured by the Constitution and laws of the Nation." Mitchum v Foster, supra, 407 U.S., at 239, 92 S.Ct., at 2160. That a federal remedy should be available, however, does not mean that a Sec. 1983 plaintiff (or his representative) must be allowed to continue an action in disregard of the state law to which Sec. 1988 refers us. A state statute cannot be

> considered 'inconsistent' with federal law merely because the statute causes the plaintiff to lose the litigation. If success of the Sec. 1983 action were the only benchmark, there would be no reason at all to look to state law, for the appropriate rule would then always be the one favoring the plaintiff, and its source would be essentially irrelevant. But Sec. 1988 quite clearly instructs us to refer to state statutes; it does not say that state law is to be accepted or rejected based solely on which side is advantaged thereby. Under the circumstances presented here, the fact that Shaw was not survived by one of several close relatives should not itself be sufficient to cause the Louisiana survivorship provisions to be deemed 'inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States.' 42 U.S.C. Sec. 1988. Robertson v Wegmann, supra, 436 U.S. at 593, 98 S.Ct. at 1996, 1997.

Although the Court ultimately applied Art. 2315 and denied the executor's action, it explicitly declined a view on the issue before us, i.e., whether a cause of action exists in favor of the estate despite state law which precludes such, where the alleged

deprivation of constitutional rights caused death. Robertson v Wegmann, supra, 436 U.S. at 594, 98 S. Ct. at 1997. Following the rationale of Robertson, there is no reason to reach a different result where the alleged constitutional violation results in death and the decedent is survived by a parent authorized to bring a wrongful death and survival action under Art. 2315. As explained in Robertson, supra, 436 U.S. at 590, 98 S.Ct. at 1995:

> In resolving questions of inconsistency between state and federal law raised under Sec. 1988, courts must look not only at particular federal statutes and constitutional provisions, but also at 'the policies expressed in [them].' Sullivan v Little Hunting Park, Inc., supra, 396 U.S., at 240, 90 S. Ct., at 406; see Moor v County of alameda, supra, 411 U.S., at 703, 93 S.Ct., at 1792. Of particular importance is whether application of state law 'would be inconsistent with the federal policy underlying the cause of action under consideration.' Johnson v Railway Express Agency, Inc., 421

U.S. 454, 465, 95 S.Ct. 1716, 1722 44 L.Ed.2d 295 (1975).

The fundamental policies behind Sec. 1983 are twofold. One is compensation for and the other is deterrence of unconstitutional acts committed under state law. Robertson v Wegmann, supra. It is this court's opinion that the remedies under Art. 2315, as applied to this case, suffice to meet the Sec. 1983 "deterrence of official misconduct" policy. Decedent in this case, unlike the plaintiff in Robertson, is survived by his father, and the damages available to him under Art. 2315 are broad. Ricard v State, supra; Roundtree v Technical Welding and Fabrication Company, Inc., 364 So.2d 1325 (La. App. 4th Cir. 1978), writ denied, 367 So.2d 389 (La. 1979).

Further, it is settled that "a state official contemplating illegal

activity must always be prepared to face the prospect of a Sec. 1983 action being filed against him. In light of this prospect, even an official aware of the intricacies of Louisiana survivorship law would hardly be influenced in his behavior by its provisions." Robertson v Wegmann, 436 U.S. at 592, 98 S.Ct. at 1996. As explained in Robertson, supra, 436 U.S. at 592, 98 S.Ct. at 1996 n.10: "In order to find even a marginal influence on behavior as a result of Louisiana's survivorship provisions, one would have to make the rather farfetched assumptions that a state official had both the desire and the ability deliberately to select as victims only those persons...who would not be survived by any close relatives."

The other stated policy, that of compensating the victim of the constitutional deprivation"...provides no basis

for reqiring compensation of one who is merely suing as the executor of the deceased's estate." Robertson v Wegmann, supra, 436 U.S. at 592, 98 S.Ct. at 1996.

We find nothing in Art. 2315 which is "inconsistent with the Constitution and laws of the United States,"[1] and again conclude the trial court correctly applied Louisiana law and properly sustained the exception of no cause of action with respect to the claims of decedent's estate. See Jones v George, 533 F.Supp. 1293 (S.D.W.Va. 1982).

---

[1] Plaintiff's reliance on Carlson v Green, supra, for the proposition that federal common law must be applied is misguided. Carlson is clearly distinguishable as a Bivens-type suit in which the plaintiff sought relief for violation of his constitutional rights by federal officials under a judicially-created remedy. The instant case is for constitutional violations by state officials pursuant to a federal statute.

A different situation is presented with the claim of decedent's siblings for loss of freedom of association with their brother. The siblings contend the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees a constitutionally protected liberty interest in the continued society and companionship of their brother, the deprivation of which is fully compensable under Sec. 1983.[2]

The U.S. Supreme Court has not decided whether a sibling has a liberty interest in the continued association of a sibling, protected from unlawful state interference by the due process clause

---

[2]The siblings make no claim pursuant to La. C.C. Art. 2315, recognizing that under that article the existence of a member of the preferred class of beneficiaries, i.e. decedent's father, precludes them from recovery. Ehrhard v State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company, 274 So.2d 911 (La. App. 1st Cir. 1973), app. denied, 279 So.2d 202 (La. 1973)

of the Fourteenth Amendment, in the context of a Sec. 1983 death action.[3] However, federal lower courts have addressed this issue and their conclusions are persuasive.

In Sanchez v Marquez, 457 F.Supp. 359 (D.Colo. 1978), a Sec. 1983 death action was brought by representatives of the victim's estate and the victim's brothers and sisters. In denying the siblings recovery, the court held that the right of association protected by the U.S. Constitution does not extend to a Sec. 1983 action arising out of the death of one's brother.

---

[3]The issue might have been addressed, but certiorari was dismissed as improvidently granted in Jones v Hildebrant, 1,550 P.2d 339 (Colo. 1976), certiorari dismissed, 432 U.S. 183, 97 S.Ct. 2283, 53 L.Ed. 2D 209 (1977), and Espinoza v O'Dell, 633 P.2d 455 (Colo. 1981), certiorari dismissed, 456 U.S. 430, 102 S.Ct 1865, 72 L.Ed.2d 237.

The court stated:

> Where the right to raise, educate and associate with one's own child may rise to constitutional dimensions, the right of siblings to have their brother or sister continue living does not. The relationship between a parent and its off-spring and the relationship between brother and sibling is not a difference in degree, it is a difference in kind. Though one has a constitutional right to have or not have a child, one does not have a constitutional right to have or not have a brother. Sanchez v Marquez, supra at 363.

Sanchez has been cited with approval by other federal courts. Beck v Kansas University Psychiatry Foundation, 580 F.Supp. 527 (D.Kan. 1984); Sager v City of Woodland Park, 543 F.Supp. 282 (D.Colo. 1982).

In Bell v City of Milwaukee, supra, the federal Seventh Circuit reversed a district court decision, 536 F.Supp. 462 (E.D.Wis. 1982), which recognized an action for loss of society and companionship among siblings:

Moreover, if we were to hold that the federal Constitution entitles the siblings to recover for loss of society and companionship, there could be no principled way of limiting such a holding to the immediate family or perhaps even to blood relatives. Obviously many human relationships stem from the 'emotional attachments that derive from the intimacy of daily association,' but we are unwilling to attach constitutional significance to such attachments outside the closely guarded parent-child relationship. Plaintiffs suggest that we could limit a holding in their favor to blood relatives in the nuclear family, arguing that injury to relationships within the nuclear family is the reasonably foreseeable result of any wrongful death. But in any wrongful death case it is reasonably foreseeable that many persons' relationships with the deceased will end, and the rationale offered for protecting blood relatives within the immediate family also extends beyond the immediate family.

Therefore, the proffered limitations in such a holding are not viable; such a holding would require us to wander without principled guidance in deciding which, if any, of a decedent's brother, sisters, aunts, uncles, cousins or even friends could recover under federal law for the deprivation of their association

with the decedent. Bell v City of Milwaukee, supra at 1247.

We conclude that constitutional authority does not permit decedent's siblings a cause of action under Sec. 1983.

The judgment of the trial court is **AFFIRMED.**

CIVIL DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
PARISH OF ORLEANS

STATE OF LOUISIANA

DIVISION "E"

NO. 84-1862 DOCKET #4

PETER A. ASCANI, SR., ET AL

VERSUS

DARRELL HUGHES

JUDGMENT

For written reasons assigned,

The claims of decedent's estate and his siblings are dismissed. The claim for punitive damages against Officers Hughes and Terrence Duffy are allowed. The exceptions of no cause of action by the City and Henry Morris are sustained as to claims under 42 U.S.C. Sect. 1983, with leave to amend in 30 days.

JUDGMENT READ, RENDERED AND SIGNED this 11th day of June, 1984.

/s/ Gerald P. Federoff
J U D G E

CIVIL DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
PARISH OF ORLEANS

STATE OF LOUISIANA

DIVISION "E"

NO. 84-1862 DOCKET #4

PETER A. ASCANI, SR., ET AL

VERSUS

DARRELL HUGHES, ET AL

REASONS FOR JUDGMENT

Upon proper proof, plaintiff is entitled to recover punitive damages against the police officer defendants. Section 1983 creates a Federal cause of action for redress of damages inflicted under color of state law. Smith v Wade is nothing more than an interpretation of Federal law. While the majority looked to Common Law for guidance, it did not adopt the common law of any state as controlling. Section 1988 arguably suggests a different result.

But since under Smith v Wade the law of the United States now "furnished suitable remedies", there is no need to extend State law to the damage aspect of 1983 actions. Cf. Justice Rehnquist's dissent, footnote #17.

The exception of no cause of action against the claim for punitive damages against the officers will be overruled.

The result is different as to the proper claimants in this action. Sec. 1983 does not define who is "injured" by a civil rights violation resulting in death. In this respect, 1983 is "deficient" and the categorical preferences established by CC Art. 2315 are appropriately engrafted onto 1983 by Sec. 1988, thereby excluding the estate and siblings as parties plainiff.

Since the City cannot be liable for punitive damages (Newport v Fact Concerts, Inc., 453 U.S. 247 (1981)), it

makes little difference if the City is subjected to 1983 liability, since any 1983 violation would also be a 2315 tort for which the City as employer would be liable. Further, the allegations do not suggest a policy involvement of the City sufficient to support a federal claim against it. Neither do the allegations suggest that Henry Morris personally subjected the decedent to the deprivation of any rights. Plaintiff however, must be allowed to cure these deficiencies by amendment, if he can, to allege a 1983 cause of action.

NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA this 11th day of June, 1984.

s/s Gerald P. Federoff
J U D G E

THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

PETER A. ASCANI, SR., et al

VS. No. 85-C-1139

DARRELL HUGHES, et al

IN RE: Ascani, Peter A.; Ascani, David Nathan; Ascani, Peter A. Jr.; Schmit, Anna; Ascani, Darius; Ascani, Jesse; Reinerth, Mercedes; Boyle, Darleen; Applying for Writ of Certiorari and/or Review; to the Court of Appeal, Fourth Circuit, Number CA-2823; Parish of Orleans Civil District Court Div. "E" Number 84-1862

June 28, 2985
Denied.

HTL
JAD
PFC
WFM
JLD
FAB
JCW

Supreme Court of Louisiana
June 28, 1985

s/s Frans Labranche
Clerk of Court
For the Court

SUPREME COURT OF THE
STATE OF LOUISIANA

NO. 85-C-1139

PETER A. ASCANI, SR., INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF THE ESTATE OF DAVID NATHAN ASCANI, PETER A. ASCANI, JR., ANNA SCHMIT, DARIUS ASCANI, JESSE ASCANI, MERCEDES REINERTH AND DARLEEN BOYLE

VERSUS

DARRELL HUGHES AND TERRENCE DUFFY, INDIVIDUALLY AND IN THEIR CAPACITIES AS OFFICERS OF THE NEW ORLEANS POLICE DEPARTMENT, HENRY MORRIS, INDIVIDUALLY AND IN HIS CAPACITY AS CHIEF OF POLICE OF THE NEW ORLEANS POLICE DEPARTMENT, THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS, THE NEW ORLEANS POLICE DEPARTMENT AND TRANSIT CASUALTY COMPANY

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Notice is hereby given that Peter A. Ascani, Sr., on behalf of the estate of David Nathan Ascani, Peter A. Ascani, Jr., Anna Schmit, Darius Ascani, Mercedes Reinerth and Darleen Boyle hereby appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States from the final judgment of this court denying Writ of

Certiorari and/or Review entered in this action on the 28th day of June 1985.

This appeal is taken pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1257.

September 13, 1985

s/s ROY A. RASPANTI
3732 Canal Street
New Orleans, La. 70119
(504) 482-5701

STATE OF LAW
CLAIM FOR RELIEF FOR LOSS OF LIFE
UNDER SEC. 1983 AND 14TH AMENDMENT

	LAW[5]	OFFICIAL[6]	CAUSED[7] DEATH	ABATED[8]	SURVIVES[9]
[1]ROBERTSON	Sec. 1983	State	No	Yes	No
[2]CARLSON	Constitution	Fed.	Yes	Yes	Yes
[3]BELL	Sec. 1983	State	Yes	Yes	Yes
[4]ASCANI	Sec. 1983	State	Yes	Yes	?

1-9 See Appendix P. 28

[1]Robertson v Wegmann, 436 U.S. 584, 98 S. Ct. 1991

[2]Carlson v Green, 446 U.S. 14, 100 C. Ct. 1474

[3]Bell v City of Milwaukee, 746 F 2d 1205 (7 Cir., 1984)

[4]Ascani v Hughes, 470 So. 2d 207 (La. App. 4 Cir. 1985)

[5]Law Violated.

[6]Official who Violated the Law.

[7]Deprivation of Constitutional Rights Caused Death.

[8]Action not Allowed Under State Law.

[9]Action Survives Under Federal Common Law.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that three copies of the foregoing Petition for Writ of Certiorari have been served upon opposing counsel of record by placing the same properly addressed in the United States Mail with adequate postage affixed thereto this the 20th day of September, 1985.

ROY A. RASPANTI